

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/683,836	BRUCE ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John B. Strege	2625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John B. Strege. (3) _____.

(2) Andrew M. Calderon Reg. # 38,093. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 02 September 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: none.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



BHAVESH M. MEHTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative suggested that none of the applied documents discloses or suggests determining whether the defects are critical defects and non-critical defects and/or that a final disposition of the component is determined by applying different acceptance rules to the critical defects and the non-critical defects. In response, the Examiner did not disagree and indicated that if, after he carefully reviewed the applied documents, the applied documents did not in fact disclose or suggest these features, he would reconsider the current prior art rejections. The Examiner also indicated that because Applicants were under final rejection, he would consider such an amendment to the claims as raising new issues.